

EXHIBIT 2

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT TO “EXPERT
REPORT ON WHIRLPOOL FRONT-
LOADING WASHER”

BY

DR. R. GARY WILSON, PH.D., P.E.

JANUARY 4, 2009

IN SUPPORT OF

WHIRLPOOL FRONT-LOADING WASHER PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

1:08-wp-65000
MDL No. 2001
Class Action

United States District Court
Northeastern District of Ohio
Eastern Division

(Supplement to "Expert Report on Whirlpool Front Loading Washer" Continued)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	3
Fundamental Design Principles of Automatic Clothes Washing Machines	3
Mold/Biofilm Growth.....	3
Design Changes to Combat the Mold/Biofilm Growth Problem	5
Rebuttal to Whirlpool's Expert Reports.....	6
Anthony Hardaway	6
Paul M. Taylor	10
Dr. Harriet Burge	11
Dr. Ned Ostojic	12
Inspection of Ms Gina Glazer's Washer	13

INTRODUCTION

I was asked by counsel to respond to certain reports written by Whirlpool's experts. Examination of the reports shows that the majority of the conclusions reached by Whirlpool's experts are contradicted by the evidence. In order to respond to the Whirlpool expert reports, it is necessary to elaborate on the opinions expressed in my previous report. I have also recently examined the Glazer washing machine and have included my observations.

All of my opinions expressed herein are to reasonable degree of mechanical engineering and design of major home cleaning appliances certainty, unless otherwise stated.

FUNDAMENTAL DESIGN PRINCIPLES OF AUTOMATIC CLOTHES WASHING MACHINES

On page 7 of my initial report (Expert Report on Whirlpool Front-Loading Washer) certain fundamentals of automatic washing machine design are stated, including the principle that "The product must be able to keep itself clean and if necessary the consumer must be able to easily clean the product." While I was a design manager and later a director of design these were the principles followed by Whirlpool who was, and still is, a leader in this industry. Criticisms that this is not a published standard ignores the fact that these remain a fundamental design principles that must be adhered to by the Whirlpool design organization and the appliance industry.

MOLD/BIOFILM GROWTH

The following is a summary of my opinions regarding mold and bacteria growth in Whirlpool Horizontal Axis ("HA") Washers:

All HA washers manufactured by Whirlpool have an inherent propensity to grow mold and bacteria on the interior surfaces of the machines. This is because of the moist, warm environment of washing machines generally, combined with the characteristics of High Efficiency ("HE") washers to use less water, lower water temperature, and a low air ventilation environment resulting in the accumulation of Biofilm on the interior surfaces of all HA washers. The accumulation of Biofilm on the interior surfaces under these conditions results in an inherent propensity to grow mold and bacteria on the interior washer components.

given the state of knowledge in the field and its own experience therein, Whirlpool knew or was reckless in not knowing that "Biofilm" was an "ideal" nutrient for toxic mold, and that the HA environment, the ideal environment for the growth of mold.

Whirlpool knew, or or was reckless in not knowing that Biofilm would spread throughout the interior of the HA washers and could not be detected until a relatively advanced stage where odor from the mold became apparent either in the washer or on the clothes.

Whirlpool knew, or or was reckless in not knowing that Biofilm could not be removed by the consumer because it was within the internal components of the machine in accessible to the consumer.

Whirlpool knew, or or was reckless in not knowing that the development of mold growing in the Biofilm takes between 1 and 2 years, while its warranty period is only 1 year.

Whirlpool knew, or or was reckless in not knowing that most of the HA washers developing Biofilm would not be detectible under after the expiration of the warranty.

Whirlpool knew or or was reckless in not knowing that it's HA washer had an inherent propensity to grow mold and bacteria which could not be self cleaned absent certain engineering considerations to properly account for these anticipated circumstances.

In the design and manufacture of its HA washers Whirlpool's engineers and scientists were reckless in not knowing that their HA machines would have the propensity to grow mold and bacteria, anticipated the growth of mold and bacteria from the accumulated Biofilm, and designed and manufactured their machines to prevent these circumstances from arising.

Whirlpool documents indicated that it was aware of Biofilm accumulation on the interior surfaces of its washing machines for approximately 25 years. In spite of this knowledge Whirlpool neither designed its HA washer to remove the Biofilm, nor informed its customers that Biofilm, and the resulting growth of mold and bacteria, was inherent in its HE washers, could not be prevented, and would require active customer participation in the removal and mitigation of mold and bacteria in all its HA washers. Even in 2004 when Whirlpool became acutely aware that the accumulation of Biofilm in its HE, HA washers was an intractable problem, and "quick fixes" were being employed by Whirlpool to mitigate some of its effects, Whirlpool nevertheless chose not to inform its customers of what Whirlpool knew to be an important consideration of its customers in purchasing Whirlpools HE, HA machines.

Whirlpool did not disclose to its customers the inherent propensity of its front load washers to grow mold in areas of accumulated Biofilm in the interior surfaces of the machines, inaccessible to customers. In fact, Whirlpool made the decision to purposefully not use the words "mold", "mildew", or "bacteria" in its communications to its customers concerning odors they were experiencing with their HA washers.

Whirlpool was reckless in not knowing in the design of its HE, HA washers that the accumulation of Biofilm on the interior surfaces of the machines would be an ideal nutrient for, and therefore probably result in the growth of mold and bacteria on interior surfaces inaccessible to customers, and inaccessible to self cleaning by the ordinary operation of the machines..

Whirlpool either knew, or was reckless in not knowing that Biofilm would accumulate throughout the interior of the HA washers especially in the cavities in the tub back wall and the basket back brace. While the consumer may notice the buildup of mold or discoloration in the door gasket area, cleaning of this area would have no effect on mold and bacteria accumulating in the interior of the machine where the bacteria growth on the Biofilm was most likely occurring.

(Supplement to "Expert Report on Whirlpool Front Loading Washer" Continued)

Whirlpool documents indicated that noticeable odor in their machines was occurring as quickly as 30 days from initial use, and often as late as two years.

Whirlpool documents indicate that as early as 2005 35% of its washers developed Biofilm. These documents included Whirlpool's critical Concept Evaluation Tollgate (CET) reports designed to be Whirlpools best engineering assessment of a problem. The 35% failure rate was also documented in the CET follow-up document called a "Letter of Findings" published by the CET preview team, a group of engineering experts assembled by Whirlpool to evaluate serious engineering difficulties encountered in the design and manufacture of its products. Whirlpool's survey documents likewise odor rates as high as 35% and 50% .

In 2004 Whirlpool assembled an engineering team specifically devoted to analysis and resolution of the Biofilm accumulation problems experienced in its Access and Horizon platform HA washers. It is apparent that Whirlpool considered the accumulation of Biofilm within its HA washers a very serious problem and devoted considerable resources to the analysis of the Biofilm accumulation problem experienced by all of its HE, HE washers. Based upon my personal experience as a manager in the Cost and Quality department in dishwasher technology at Whirlpool, it is highly improbable that Whirlpool would have engaged in a project on this scale for a product experiencing only a 0.27% failure rate.

In the design of Whirlpool's Access and Horizon platform washers, Whirlpool failed to consider the inherent propensity of high efficiency, horizontal axis washing machines to accumulate Biofilm on the interior surfaces of the machines. It failed to design its HA washers to prevent the development and accumulation of Biofilm on the interior surfaces of its HA washers, and it failed to design its machines to self clean the accumulated Biofilm either on each wash cycle, or with sufficient frequency to prevent the growth of mold, and bacteria on the accumulated Biofilm. These engineer design failures were contrary to fundamental design principles which Whirlpool itself claims to adhere to.

Whirlpool knew, or was reckless in not knowing that the cleanliness of its washers was an important, if not the most important consideration of its customers in the purchase of Whirlpool washing machines. In spite of this knowledge, Whirlpool's Access and Horizon platform washing machines were accumulating Biofilm on their interior surfaces leading to the development of mold and bacteria that could not be cleaned by the machines. Whirlpool knew, or or was reckless in not knowing , that this problem was not solved by its "quick fixes", yet it continued to market its expensive, and "state of the art" washers when Whirlpool knew that its customers would not have purchased them had they known of their propensity to accumulated Biofilm and the growth of mold and bacteria.

DESIGN CHANGES TO COMBAT THE MOLD/BIOFILM GROWTH PROBLEM

The following are a summary of my opinions in response to the WP Expert reports I reviewed:

Whirlpool eventually made design changes to its HA washers to mitigate the inherent propensity of its front load washers to grow mold and bacteria, though these changes did not solve the underlying defect or eliminate the growth of mold and bacteria. The Access platform design that was released to production in 2002 was not designed to remove or even minimize

(Supplement to "Expert Report on Whirlpool Front Loading Washer" Continued)

the inherent propensity for mold and bacteria to grow inside the washers. In 2004 Whirlpool began to release design changes starting with the control system software, the tub back wall, and the basket back brace. These changes were made in an attempt to mitigate the problem, but did not solve the problem.

Whirlpool failed to properly consider the inherent propensity of its Access platform washer to grow mold and bacteria. The Access platform was initially designed with deep cavities in the back of the tub and the basket brace allowing for the accumulation of Biofilm to be collected on the brace.

Whirlpool failed to prevent by design the formation of Biofilm.

Whirlpool was willing to accept the accumulation of Biofilm and the resultant growth of mold and bacteria as a "trade off" for HE technology. However, Whirlpool's failure to disclose the technological difficulties in its HE technology to its customer, prevented those customers from themselves deciding the acceptability of the "trade off". and prevented those customers from making an informed decision as to whether the "trade off" was worth the premium price paid for HA washers.

Whirlpool's attempts to manage the propensity of 100% of their HA washers to grow mold were ineffective. The results of the clean out cycles with bleach or Affresh were only temporally effective at best.

The "quick fixes" using bleach as a chemical bath and the cycle change were implemented in late 2004 and early 2005. The use of bleach was detrimental to the structural components of the HA washers and Affresh was not generally available until sometime in 2007.

Based upon my experience with Whirlpool, its major appliances were designed to have a minimum 10 year life.

Whirlpool should have anticipated that some consumers would not use the recommended HE detergent and that using the non-HE detergent would lead to dried out suds in hard to rinse cavities on the interior of the front load washers which would lead to Biofilm.

The Whirlpool documents indicated that once a "cleaning cycle" was developed, Whirlpool initially hid the cycle, and its purpose from customers.

REBUTTAL TO WHIRLPOOL'S EXPERT REPORTS

ANTHONY HARDAWAY

My rebuttal to the expert opinions of Anthony Hardaway include, but are not limited to, the following:

Hardaway admits that Whirlpool has been working on the Biofilm problem for more than 25 years. Based on my experience I estimate that Whirlpool has been aware of the potential of buildup

(Supplement to "Expert Report on Whirlpool Front Loading Washer" Continued)

residue for much more than 25 years. Prior to being termed "Biofilm" the accumulation of debris was referred to as "Scrud" by the engineers.

Hardaway admits that the lower water usage front load machines do not rinse down the interior as well as vertical machines. It is my opinion that this is a design flaw and should have been addressed in the original design.

It is my opinion that even if customers do follow a maintenance routine there will still be a Biofilm build-up. No maintenance routine will completely rinse out, for example, the deep cavities in the back wall of the tub and prevent Biofilm from accumulating.

By design the machine operates with low water/energy consumption which directly causes an increased occurrence of Biofilm if the machine is not also "designed" to rinse the interior well enough to minimize the buildup of residue and also designed to reduce the areas where biofilm is likely to accumulate. Clearly these machines are not rinsing themselves well enough to prevent this problem and there are too many locations where biofilm can collect.

It is my opinion that the design is a major cause of the buildup since the machine was clearly not designed to minimize the buildup of these residues and rinse itself well.

It is my opinion that the low water level leads to more surface area that cannot be rinsed so there is more surface area for the Biofilm to collect. Therefore, there is more material available upon which the organisms can grow.

It is my opinion that the data indicates that there will be a residue build-up in all front loading Whirlpool washing machines except in a few cases.

It is my opinion that Whirlpool was reckless in not knowing and in my opinion probably did know that this was an issue before 2005. The design and laboratory engineers at the St. Joe Tech Center should have been able to predict that there was going to be a biofilm/odor problem with the design.

Feedback from the field that the suggested fix of using bleach and hot water washes only temporally reduces the odor problem. In my opinion this is evidence that the chemical washes only reduce/kill some of the organisms and that in a relatively short time they simply multiply growing back to the extent that the odor returns.

Based on my experience running a cost and quality department at Whirlpool I find it unlikely that these type of incoming complaints were not being tracked for this high end washer.

In my opinion the field data confirms that the drain hose is also a collection point for Biofilm and is therefore an odor source that would become apparent during a drain.

In my opinion that the Biofilm spreads throughout the machine and confirms the odor and Biofilm connection.

In my opinion Biofilm is systemic for all Access/Horizon washers and that Whirlpool made design trade-offs that resulted in this type of problem.

(Supplement to "Expert Report on Whirlpool Front Loading Washer" Continued)

It is my opinion that good engineering principles required that the design of the Access and Horizon HA washers account for the potential of Biofilm to propagate mold, bacteria, and fungus and to design their washers to prevent this from occurring.

It is my opinion that the design of the back of the tub (for example) allows Biofilm to collect and the cavities cannot be adequately rinsed to remove build-up or even allow chemical solutions to come into contact with organisms growing on the Biofilm in the cavities.

There appears to be no data to support the claim that the instructions provided the consumer in the Use and Care Instructions will properly manage the Biofilm problem.

It is my opinion that one source of the odor that is often exhibited on the clothes occurs when the Biofilm rubs off the inside of the basket and transfers to the clothes due to the action of the clothes but still occurs on the outside of the basket. So the clothes may appear to be clean but they may in fact be contaminated by biofilm/bacterial/mold which could eventually if not immediately produce an odor.

It is my opinions that the odor problem can occur as early as 30 days of usage or as long as two years, and that the odor could return as quickly as 24 hours if the cleaning process was not effective.

In my opinion Whirlpool realized that the cavities on the inside of (water side) of the tub would promote the buildup of Biofilm on the tub and that a design change was necessary to mitigate this problem. These designs should have been in the machine originally. Whirlpool, using generally accepted engineering expertise should have recognized that the cavities on the water side of the tub would be a major collection point for debris that would lead to Biofilm, organism growth, and offensive odor.

From my experience at Whirlpool, the Concept Evaluation Tollgate are a critical component of proper engineering practice. Errors, such as claims regarding the magnitude of product, cannot remain either unverified, nor incorrectly stated. The failure to do so is contrary to proper project management (C2C). It is improbable that a project of this scale and magnitude and human resource intensive would have ever been initiated for a problem that resulted in only 0.27% failure rate.

It is my opinion and based on my experience, if the 35% failure rate had been recognized as an error, as Whirlpool now claims, the preview team would have been alerted and a document (letter of findings) with the correction would have officially been released to the CET review members. The failure to issue a correction would be contrary to Whirlpool's project management process. The fact that the 35% failure was not highlighted as an error in the follow up documents and the magnitude of the project leads me to believe that the organization indeed believed that a failure rate of 35% was correct.

In my opinion Whirlpool claims that the consumer will have to provide a continuing course of maintenance to prevent the buildup of Biofilm. But what he fails to mention is that the design engineers will also have to keep the prevention of Biofilm as a key design objective for future washer designs. For example, designing the inside back of the tub with deep cavities is a gross design error which could have been avoided by simply moving the cavities to the outside of the tub. This is just one design change that would have helped to minimize the buildup right from the launch date.

(Supplement to "Expert Report on Whirlpool Front Loading Washer" Continued)

In my opinion not only are all of the Access platforms similar and all of the Horizon platforms similar, the Access and Horizon platforms are from an engineering standpoint similar to each other.

It is my opinion that when the washer door is closed the vent in the back of the washer does not allow enough air flow through the machine to dry it out and prevent fungal and bacteria growth. It also supports my opinion that the HA washer does not adequately rinse the interior surfaces and thus minimize the build-up of residues.

It is my opinion that WP has been working on this problem for more than 25 years and that there is an odor associated with the Biofilm.

Based on my experience when services call come in at the rate described in this exhibit there is indeed a serious field problem and in this case "bad odors, mold, and mildew" are specifically called out as an issue. It also states that the field problems ramped up to this level as early as September 2003.

Based on my experience projects (like the Biofilm project of April 2004) were not Kicked-Off unless Whirlpool thought that the problem was very serious and in this case "odor and mildew" were referenced as the issue to be resolved.

It is my opinion that the accumulation of Biofilm in the HEHA washers and the resulting growth of mold, mildew and bacteria on the interior surfaces of the washers is not solely dependent upon the geographic location of the machine but rather function of a "design that permits build-ups over time." The findings also confirm my opinion that contamination remaining in the machine after a wash or even a clean out cycle will grow and spread through the inside of the machine.

It is my opinion that the design does not allow adequate rinsing of the interior components to minimize the growth of mold and bacteria so this "ideal environment" supports the rapid growth of molds and bacteria that produce the offensive odors.

It is my opinion that the "sheeting off for redeposition back onto the clothes load" is a source of the odors that are often associated with the clothes. It is also my opinion that some the Biofilm that sheets off gets trapped in the pump strainer and the drain hose. This would cause the drain hose to have a more severe and rapid buildup of odor producing mold and bacteria which would produce an odor during pump out that may be more severe than for a conventional washer. Also, since the sump area and the pump boot/strainer are not completely sealed off by the ball/check valve the sump area and sump residual water are always contaminated since the drain hose/pump/strainer/boot, sump system are always filled with water that connects the components of the drain system.

It is my opinion that the HA washer does not rinse the internal components and surfaces adequately and that the chemical washers cannot reach all problem areas as stated "chlorine bleach is effective in removing buildup to approximately half the way up the tub."

It is my opinion that the design (especially the early design of the ACCESS washer) provides an excessive amount of surface area which cannot be adequately cleaned or rinsed and allows for the residues mentioned in this exhibit to collect. This leads to the growth of an excessive amount of "bacterial and/or mold/mildew" which eventually produces the offensive odor associated with the Whirlpool HA washers.

(Supplement to "Expert Report on Whirlpool Front Loading Washer" Continued)

It is my opinion that the Biofilm problem is systemic and persistent. Whirlpool confirms that it can occur in any North American geographic location as soon as 30 days of usage or as late as 2-3 years and once treated it can reoccur within 24 hours. Whirlpool likewise has admitted that this problem is inherent to HE systems.

It is my opinion that the back wall of the tub which is "webbed" is an area of severe collection of residues. It is my opinion that having the cavities on the water side of the tub is a major design flaw that leads to the excessive collection of residue and the eventual growth of odor producing bacteria and mold. It also supports my opinion that not using HE detergents is not a root cause of the problem.

It is my opinion that the tub back wall is a major collection site of residue that cannot be adequately rinsed and is therefore a an accumulation point of mold and bacteria growth that eventually produces an odor. It is also my opinion that residue build-up can occur in numerous locations internal to the washer.

It is my opinion that the mold and bacteria growing inside the washer is the source of the front load washers' foul odors.

It is my opinion that a hidden clean out cycle was added to the washer controller in an attempt to manage the bacterial growth and odor issue.

It is my opinion that the design of the washer is a major contributor to the buildup of residue/biofilm and that design changes can be made to help reduce/minimize the problem.

Based on my experience an engineering project of this magnitude and resource intensive would not have been initiated for a SIR rate <1% while a failure rate of 35% would certainly justify the project. It is also my opinion that basic design errors that are systemic to the HA platforms contribute to the excessive buildup of residues/biofilm which lead to foul odors.

It is my opinion that since the 35% failure rate/complaint rate is restated in the Technology Letter of Findings that this must be the actual failure rate that the HA washers are experiencing and also justifies the size of the project and effort to correct the problem.

It is my opinion that the mold and bacteria feed on the biofilm and eventually produce foul odors.

It is my opinion that when the HA was originally designed the accumulation of residues/biofilm was not considered in the design. That is, there was not a design specification requiring the design to minimize the buildup of biofilm. It is my opinion that not designing to minimize the buildup of biofilm is a gross design error and has resulted in a systemic problem.

It is my opinion that the WP HA washers cannot adequately clean themselves due to poor design and therefore buildup excessive amounts of residue/biofilm that ultimately results in foul odors.

PAUL M. TAYLOR

My rebuttal to the expert opinions of Paul M. Taylor, to the extent his opinions are not addressed by the above, include, but are not limited to, the following:

(Supplement to "Expert Report on Whirlpool Front Loading Washer" Continued)

Whirlpool's engineers have confirmed that the accumulation of debris in the machines must be addressed by design changes and that the machines must be able to self-clean.

The floating ball does not 100% seal off the contents in the drain boot so there is still a communication between the fluid in the boot and the remaining part of the machine.

[[Insert photo here]]

It is my opinion the areas interior to the machine such as the back inside of the tub, the basket bracket and the back side of the door seal cannot be manually cleaned. Also, the chemical washes only reach part of the Biofilm and leave part of the machine untouched.

[[photos, fully assembled, visible side of the seal non-visible side, the basket back side]]

In my opinion and as stated in Hardaway's Affidavit, the design of Whirlpool's HA HE washers are substantially the same of the purposes of the issues in this litigation.

Taylor's opinion is in conflict with Whirlpool Exhibit 35 in which it is stated that the "service cycle is only able to remove 80% of existing deposits" which means that 20% remains and "seeds" the machine such that the problem starts over. In my opinion 80% removal is insufficient. The remaining Biofilm is enough to recontaminate the machine, and reuse of the machine will result in further accumulation of the Biofilm.

Only the front loading washing segment of the industry has adopted the need for consumer maintenance with respect to Biofilm and mold, mildew and bacteria remediation. The need for remediation arises because Whirlpool's design does not effectively clean the interior components of the machine. The consumer was not told that the HA machine requires this "new" added level of maintenance.

DR. HARRIET BURGE

My rebuttal to the expert opinions of Dr. Harriet Burge, to the extent her opinions are not addressed by the above, include, but are not limited to, the following:

My usage of the term "Biofilm" is consistent with Whirlpool's usage. From an engineering standpoint the net effect is the same. Mold and bacteria are growing in the machine and producing an odor.

There are interior surfaces of the Whirlpool washers, such as the back tub wall cavities, that will take time to dry out, and may not effectively drying out between washes. Also, from an engineering standpoint the vent is for safety reasons and to minimize surge, and does not allow enough air flow to allow the machine to dry out completely. Based on my experience there is always a residual amount of moisture in the machine. For example in the drain boot and sump area water is usually present. Further, the ball check valve in the boot does not completely seal off the boot since there is an additional opening that is not sealed by the float.

(Supplement to "Expert Report on Whirlpool Front Loading Washer" Continued)

Dr. Burge overlooks the admissions made by Whirlpool that all HA front load washing machines have this problem.

The analysis I made is an accepted industry practice. In a high volume industry such as the appliance industry it is customary and accepted to reach valid conclusions regarding the finished product using limited data sets and engineering experience. In fact this is the same analysis used by Whirlpool when I was there and by Whirlpool in its deposition.

DR. NED OSTOJIC

My rebuttal to the expert opinions of Dr. Ned Ostojic, to the extent his opinions are not addressed by the above, include, but are not limited to, the following:

Dr. Ostojic ignores several sources of information which contradict a low odor complaint rate in front load washing machines. Also, as stated above, , based on my experience no project of the magnitude by which Whirlpool responded to the Biofilm in the front load washing machines would have been initiated for a small problem.

Based on Whirlpool's own documents Biofilm can occur in all climates and conditions.

Based on the machines that were torn down and reviewing the design of the machine interior components, it is my opinion that all of the WP HA washers will accumulate residue/Biofilm which in most cases will result in foul odors.

It is my opinion that the Biofilm can peel off and can be deposited onto the clothes.

INSPECTION OF MS GINA GLAZER'S WASHER

On December 31, 2009 I inspected Gina Glazer's washer which is a Horizon washer Model Number WFW8300SW00, Serial Number HLT1690148. Upon entry to the laundry room a faint foul odor was detected and the general condition of the machine indicated that it was being used in normal household operations, and in a reasonably anticipated manner. The washer drains into a laundry sink. I removed the lower panel and using a high power light I illuminated the sump area and surrounding upper walls of the tub from the outside of the tub in the washer machine compartment. By manually spinning the basket and looking from the inside of the basket and placing the light as described above I could see the inside of the lower tub when the basket was spinning. Upon this initial viewing some debris was observed in the sump area but not to the same degree as I observed during the teardown of washers in Benton Harbor or the teardown of Plaintiff washers in Charlotte. But there was debris.

Next, I removed the pump strainer and observed a number of foreign objects in the strainer as well as a buildup of residue in the strainer and the strainer housing. The odor from the opening of the strainer was not as severe as that observed when the Snyder washer strainer was opened. I replaced the strainer and the kick panel and ran the machine through a fill and agitation and then a drain. Immediately upon the initiation of the drain debris exited the drain hose and a severe odor was detected. I repeated the procedure and observed a lesser amount of debris exiting the hose and a much less severe odor. The process was repeated a third time and no debris exited the hose and there was not an odor.

I removed the kick panel a second time and illuminated the tub as described above. Approximately the same amount of debris was observed in the sump area. The pump strainer was opened and little to no additional debris was observed. The drain hose had a considerable buildup at the exit.

The door gasket was severely stained and the stains could not be removed by wiping with a paper towel. Upon rolling back the gasket to observe the gasket drain holes there was a buildup of debris at the drain holes and up each side of the gasket. At the water entry point there was also a collection/buildup of residue. The interior of the basket was bright and clean.

In summary, while there was a slight odor coming from the washer the most severe odor came during the first drain when debris were exiting the drain hose. This indicates to me that there are large amounts of debris that collect in the hose and appeared on inspection to be Biofilm. While some the debris may be from a "natural" buildup in the hose itself, it is my opinion that most of the debris originates in the washer and gets trapped in the hose. It is my opinion that this excessive amount of debris breeds bacteria which produces an odor that becomes readily apparent the next time the washer pumps to drain and the drain hose is flushed out. Since the drain water covered the laundry sink drain it was not possible for the odor to originate from the sink drain.

Signature Page

I reserve the right to supplement my report based on any new information or any modified opinions from Whirlpool or its experts.

This report is respectfully submitted by:

R. Gary Wilson 01-04-2010

Dr. R. Gary Wilson, Ph.D., P.E.